

**FAX SUBMISSION TO USPTO**

**Docket No.** MCZ003

**Serial No.** 10/634,041

**Filing Date** 07/31/2003

**Gp/Art Unit** 3611

**Examiner** Lum Vanucci, Lee Sin Yee

**Applicant** Michael Czysz

**Title** Motorcycle Fork Bottom Having  
Different Longitudinal Stiffness  
and Adjustable Sideways Stiffness


**Submission** Response and Amendment

**Total Pages** 13 ~~12~~ including this cover sheet

**Dated** 03/16/2005

**Office Action Date** 12/01/2004

**Submitted By** Richard C. Calderwood, #35,468



Application No. 10/634,041

Amendment dated 3/15/2005 responding to Office Action dated 12/01/2004

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE	
Applicant: Michael Czysz	
Appl. No.: 10/634,041	Gp/Art Unit: 3611
Filed: 7/31/2003	
Title: Motorcycle Fork Bottom Having Different Longitudinal Stiffness and Adjustable Sideways Stiffness	Examiner: Lum Vannucci, Lee Sin Yee
Docket No.: MCZ003	

Commissioner for Patents

Portland, Oregon  
Date March 16, 2005P.O. Box. 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE**

Dear Sir,

This is in response to the Office Action mailed 12/01/2004 (which followed Applicant's 11/08/2004 Response After Final). In the new Office Action: (1) the Examiner provides new issues of clarity, and maintains previous rejections of cancelled claims 1 and 13; (2) the Specification is objected to as failing to provide antecedent basis for language in claim 19; (3) claim 19 is rejected under 35 USC 112 second paragraph as unclear; (4) claims 2, 9, 11, 12, 14, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) over US Patent 6,017,047 to Hoose; (5.a) Claims 3-8 and 15-17 were objected to, and (3.b) Claims 21-24 and 26-28 were indicated as being allowable. Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing which begins on page 3 of this paper. Remarks begin on page 7 of this paper.

Docket: MCZ003

Page 1

Amendment 3